Commission de la fonction publique du Canada
Public Service Commission of Canada

2018/09/28

Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey: Report on the Results for the Federal Public Service

Canada

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

In-scope survey respondents 5

Reporting of results 5

Highlights 6

Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency 7

Consideration of priority entitlements 8

Perceptions of the New Direction in Staffing 9

Perceptions of organizational staffing policies and practices 11

Perceptions of staffing advice and support 12

Awareness and understanding of political activities and non-partisanship 14

Appendix A: Participating departments and agencies 17

List of tables

Table 1: Highlights by theme 6

Table 2: Results for questions related to merit, fairness, and transparency 7

Table 3: Results for questions related to external pressure or personal indebtedness towards one or more employees 8

Table 4: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers regarding the consideration of priority entitlements 8

Table 5: Results for questions related to the consideration of priority entitlements 8

Table 6: Results for questions related to the New Direction in Staffing 10

Table 7: Results for questions related to sub-delegation and attestation 10

Table 8: Results for questions related to staffing policies and practices 11

Table 9: Results related to the provision of useful staffing advice (**staffing advisors**) 12

Table 10: Results related to the staffing advice and services received (**managers**) 12

Table 11: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers in each of the following areas 13

Table 12: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that the input they provided to managers influenced managers' staffing actions in each of the following areas 13

Table 13: Percentage of **managers** who indicated that the information provided to them by staffing advisors assigned to their appointment processes was **not useful** 14

Table 14: Results related to engagement in political activities 14

Table 15: Results related to awareness and understanding of political activities 15

Table 16: Results related to awareness and understanding of non-partisanship 15

Table 17: Participating departments and agencies, and final response rates 17

Introduction

The Public Service Commission of Canada is responsible for promoting and safeguarding a merit-based, representative and non-partisan public service that serves all Canadians.

The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was introduced in 2018 as a biennial public service-wide survey.[1] Data collection took place over a period of 8 weeks — between February 22 and April 20, 2018. The survey targeted employees, hiring managers and staffing advisors to gather their views on a wide range of staffing-related topics, including the New Direction in Staffing, organizational staffing policies and practices, as well as political activities and non-partisanship.

Invitations to complete the survey were sent to 214 275 public servants across 74 departments and agencies subject to the Public Service Employment Act. A total of 101 892 employees completed the survey, representing an overall response rate of 47.6%. A complete list of participating departments and agencies with their respective response rates is found in Appendix A.

This report provides a summary of the survey's key results across federal public service departments and agencies that staff under the Public Service Employment Act.[2] Because the content of this survey is different from its predecessor (the Survey of Staffing), year-over-year comparisons are not always possible. More information on the survey is available on Statistics Canada's survey webpage.

In addition to this government-wide report, we are developing:

- organisation-specific reports
- an interactive web-based visualization tool allowing departments and agencies to explore the survey data and generate customized data tables
- a series of thematic reports on merit, fairness, and transparency, the New Direction in Staffing and non-partisanship

If you have any questions related to the content of this report, don't hesitate to contact us by email at: cfp.SDIP-SNPS.psc@canada.ca

[1] The Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey was conducted by Statistics Canada on behalf of the Public Service Commission of Canada.

[2] While survey respondents from a variety of occupational groups indicated they were a staffing advisor, results to staffing advisor questions in this report are restricted to those from the PE group, as the intent of these questions was to solicit views of the HR community.

In-scope survey respondents

The results in this report are based on all full-time indeterminate and term employees. Part-time and seasonal employees, casuals, students, contractors, Governor-in-Council appointees and ministers' exempt staff are excluded from this analysis. Results also include members of the regular Canadian Armed Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who conduct staffing activities under the Public Service Employment Act.

Reporting of results

The data presented in this report has been weighted to adjust for non-response and for respondents who did not want to share their data with the Public Service Commission of Canada. Therefore, the results can be generalized to the federal public service population in departments and agencies that are subject to the Public Service Employment Act.

Results are shown as percentages for 3 categories of responses:

1. "yes" or "no"
2. "strongly agree"; "somewhat agree"; neither agree nor disagree"; "somewhat disagree"; or "strongly disagree"
3. "not at all"; to a minimal extent"; "to a moderate extent"; or "to a great extent"

For all of the above, "don't know", "not applicable" and "unable to assess" responses are excluded.

Each major section of the report begins with highlights of the findings, followed by relevant tables. Within each table, positively phrased questions are presented first, followed by negatively phrased questions, where applicable.[3]

To protect the confidentiality of respondents, results are only provided for questions with at least 10 respondents. For ease of reference, the survey question numbers are reported in the tables. A copy of the survey questionnaire is available on Statistics Canada's website.

[3] Negatively phrased questions are questions for which positive responses refer to negative outcomes. For example, a positive response to the statement "Within my organization, the administrative process involved in order to staff a position is burdensome," would represent a negative outcome.

Highlights

The following table provides a summary of the highlights presented in this report.

Table 1: Highlights by theme

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	
Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency	**Merit** Managers are more positive than employees about merit ➢ 91.9% of **managers** believed that appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired ➢ 92.4% of **managers** believed appointees are a good fit within the team ➢ 53.8% of **employees** indicated that people hired in their work unit can do the job **Fairness** ➢ 46.4% of **employees** indicated that, in their work units, staffing activities are conducted fairly ➢ 54.0% of **employees** indicated that, in their work units, appointments depend on who you know **Transparency** ➢ 44.3% of **employees** indicated that, in their work units, staffing activities are carried out in a transparent way
Consideration of priority entitlements	**Priority entitlements for veterans** ➢ 93.0% of **staffing advisors** indicated being sufficiently informed of the changes to the priority entitlements in the Veterans Hiring Act to provide advice to managers ➢ 65.8% of **managers** reported a moderate or great understanding of the provisions that help veterans gain employment in the federal public service **Overall priority entitlements** ➢ 49.9% of **managers** indicated that priority entitlements **limit** their ability to hire persons who are good fit within their work unit
Perceptions of the New Direction in Staffing (NDS)	➢ 93.3% of **staffing advisors** indicated that they were well informed about the NDS ➢ 61.4% of **managers** indicated that they understand the NDS ➢ 46.3% of **managers** indicated that the NDS had made staffing simpler
Perceptions of organizational staffing policies and practices	Most **managers** feel staffing is burdensome (87.9%) and not quick enough (62.4%)
Perceptions of staffing advice and support	More than half of **managers** (59.4%) were satisfied with the services provided by staffing advisors
Awareness and understanding of political activities	While most **employees** (80.1%) reported that they understand their rights and obligations for engaging in political activities, only 63.6% believed that their organizations kept them well informed
Awareness and understanding of non-partisanship	An overwhelming majority of **employees** (96.4%) believed they could carry out their duties in a politically impartial manner

Perceptions of merit, fairness and transparency

Highlights

Managers are more positive than employees about merit

- While most **managers** believed that appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired (91.9%) and are a good fit within the team (92.4%), just over half of **employees** (53.8%) agreed that people hired in their work unit can do the job
- Less than half of **employees** indicated that, in their work units, staffing activities are conducted fairly (46.4%) and in a transparent way (44.3%)
    - Over half of **employees** indicated that, in their work unit, appointments depend on who you know (54.0%)
- Just over 75% of **managers** reported not feeling any external pressure to hire a particular employee

Table 2: Results for questions related to merit, fairness, and transparency

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Positively phrased					
Extent **employees** agreed that people hired in their work units can do the job (ALL_Q05B)	16.4%	37.4%	15.3%	19.8%	10.9%
Extent **managers** agreed that appointees meet the performance expectations of the positions for which they were hired (MAN_Q60A)	63.7%	28.2%	3.3%	2.5%	2.3%
Extent **managers** agreed that the persons they appointed are a good fit within their assigned teams or work units (MAN_Q60B)	67.0%	25.4%	3.1%	2.3%	2.2%
Extent **employees** agreed that the process used for selecting persons for positions in their work units is done fairly (ALL_Q05D)	14.0%	32.4%	21.6%	18.2%	13.8%
Extent **employees** agreed that staffing activities in their work units are carried out in a transparent way (ALL_Q05A)	13.8%	30.5%	17.5%	20.0%	18.2%
Negatively phrased					
Extent **employees** agreed that appointments for positions in their work units depend on who you know (ALL_Q05C)	19.5%	34.5%	22.5%	12.5%	11.0%

Table 3: Results for questions related to external pressure or personal indebtedness towards one or more employees

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Negatively phrased				
Extent **managers** agreed that they felt external pressure to select a particular employee (MAN_Q85A)	75.6%	11.6%	7.3%	5.4%
Extent **managers** agreed that they felt a sense of personal indebtedness to one or more employees (MAN_Q85B)	81.2%	12.5%	4.9%	1.5%

Consideration of priority entitlements

Highlights

- 93% of **staffing advisors** indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, they are sufficiently informed of the changes to the priority entitlements in the Veterans Hiring Act to provide advice to managers
- Approximately two-thirds of **managers** (65.8%) reported a moderate or great understanding of the provisions that help veterans gain employment in the federal public service
    - Nearly 50% of **managers** indicated that priority entitlements **limit** their ability to hire persons who are a good fit within their work unit

Table 4: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers regarding the consideration of priority entitlements

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Yes	No
Consideration of persons with priority entitlements (ADV_Q15A)	88.6%	11.4%

Table 5: Results for questions related to the consideration of priority entitlements

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Positively phrased				
Extent **managers** indicated that they understand the provisions that help veterans gain employment in the federal public service (MAN_Q80I)	13.5%	20.7%	35.9%	29.9%

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are sufficiently informed about changes to priority entitlements included in the Veterans Hiring Act so as to provide sound advice to managers within their organization (ADV_Q10D)	1.0%	6.0%	31.6%	61.4%
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that their input regarding consideration of priority entitlements influenced managers' staffing decisions (ADV_Q20A)	2.0%	14.5%	35.1%	48.4%
Negatively phrased				
Extent **managers** agreed that priority entitlements limit their ability to appoint persons who are a good fit within their work unit (MAN_Q80H)	18.5%	31.6%	30.4%	19.5%

Perceptions of the New Direction in Staffing

Highlights

- 93.3% of **staffing advisors** felt sufficiently informed, to a moderate or great extent, about how their department or agency is implementing the New Direction in Staffing and 93.1% believed that they could explain to managers how implementation of the New Direction in Staffing relates to managers' staffing needs
    - 61.4% of **managers** indicated having a moderate or great understanding of the New Direction in Staffing
- While 93.2% of **staffing advisors** believed that, to a moderate or great extent, the New Direction in Staffing provides managers with the ability to customize their staffing activities based on organizational needs, just over half of **managers** (56.1%) believed that the New Direction in Staffing has improved staffing in their department or agency
- Less than half of **managers** (46.3%) indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, the New Direction in Staffing has made staffing simpler in their department or agency
    - Over one-quarter of **managers** (26.2%) did not believe at all that the New Direction in Staffing has made staffing simpler in their department or agency

Table 6: Results for questions related to the New Direction in Staffing

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are sufficiently informed about how their organization has chosen to implement the New Direction in Staffing (NDS) (ADV_Q10A)	1.4%	5.3%	20.4%	72.9%
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they can explain to managers how their organization's implementation of the NDS relates to their staffing needs (ADV_Q10B)	1.6%	5.3%	21.8%	71.3%
Extent **managers** indicated that that they understand the NDS (MAN_Q80A)	15.1%	23.4%	42.3%	19.1%
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that the NDS provides managers with the ability to customize their staffing activities based on organizational needs (ADV_Q10C)	1.1%	5.7%	26.9%	66.3%
Extent **managers** indicated that the NDS has improved the way they hire and appoint persons to and within their organization (MAN_Q80B)	18.5%	25.4%	38.9%	17.2%
Extent **managers** indicated that the NDS has resulted in staffing being made simpler in their organization (MAN_Q80C)	26.2%	27.6%	32.4%	13.9%
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that the implementation of the Attestation Form has served to reinforce sub-delegated managers' key accountabilities (ADV_Q10E)	6.3%	20.5%	41.7%	31.6%

Table 7: Results for questions related to sub-delegation and attestation

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Yes	No
Managers who indicated that they have sub-delegated authority to make appointments to and within their organizations by their deputy heads (MAN_Q10A)	23.6%	76.4%
Managers who indicated that they have signed an **Attestation Form** (MAN_Q10B)	93.5%	6.5%

Perceptions of organizational staffing policies and practices

Highlights

Most managers feel staffing is burdensome and not quick enough

- Over 85% of **managers** indicated that the administrative process to staff positions in their department or agency is burdensome
    - And more than half (55.5%) indicated that this process is burdensome to a great extent
- Nearly 75% of **managers** indicated that they have a moderate or great understanding of their department or agency's staffing policies
- While most **managers** (60.0%) felt that, to a moderate or great extent, staffing options within their department or agency provide them with flexibility in appointing persons who are a good fit within their work unit, only a minority of **managers** (37.6%) believed that these staffing options allow them to staff as quickly as required
    - One-quarter of **managers** indicated staffing options do not allow them to staff as quickly as required

Table 8: Results for questions related to staffing policies and practices

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Positively phrased				
Extent **managers** indicated that they understand their organizations' policies with respect to staffing (MAN_Q80D)	6.1%	20.7%	45.2%	27.9%
Extent **managers** indicated that the staffing options available to them within their organizations allow them to address their staffing needs as quickly as required (MAN_Q80F)	24.9%	37.5%	29.9%	7.7%
Extent **managers** indicated that the staffing options available to them within their organizations provide them with the flexibility to appoint persons who were a good fit within their work units (MAN_Q80G)	13.2%	26.8%	41.1%	18.9%
Negatively phrased				
Extent **managers** indicated that the administrative process to staff positions within their organizations is burdensome (MAN_Q80E)	1.9%	10.1%	32.4%	55.5%

Perceptions of staffing advice and support

Highlights

More than half of managers were satisfied with the services provided by staffing advisors

- Over 98% of **staffing advisors** were confident, to a moderate or great extent, in their ability to provide managers with useful staffing advice, while 72.7% of managers believed that the advice provided was useful
- Nearly 6 out of 10 **managers** (59.4%) indicated that, overall, they were satisfied with the staffing services they received from their department or agency
- According to **staffing advisors**, managers mainly sought their strategic input on:
    - the selection tools and methods to be used to assess candidates
    - establishing the merit criteria
    - the choice of staffing process
    - identifying the area of selection
- These are also the 4 areas where a vast majority of **staffing advisors** believed that, to a moderate or great extent, they had the most influence on managers' staffing actions

Table 9: Results related to the provision of useful staffing advice (**staffing advisors**)

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **staffing advisors** indicated that they are confident in their ability to provide managers with useful advice on staffing (ADV_Q10F)	0.4%	1.3%	16.0%	82.3%

Table 10: Results related to the staffing advice and services received (**managers**)

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations provide them with consistent staffing advice (MAN_Q65A)	33.1%	35.7%	10.3%	12.9%	8.0%
Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations provide them with useful staffing advice (MAN_Q65B)	36.2%	36.5%	10.7%	10.2%	6.5%
Extent **managers** agreed that staffing advisors in their organizations acted proactively to help them fill positions with the appointees they need (MAN_Q75A)	22.8%	28.9%	16.9%	18.3%	13.2%

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Extent **managers** agreed that, overall, they were satisfied with the staffing services they received within their organizations (MAN_Q75B)	28.2%	31.2%	13.7%	15.1%	11.8%

Table 11: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that their strategic input was sought by managers in each of the following areas

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Yes	No
Testing accommodation for candidates (ADV_Q15B)	66.1%	33.9%
Employment equity considerations (ADV_Q15C)	56.2%	43.8%
Identifying the area of selection (ADV_Q15D)	89.3%	10.7%
Establishing the merit criteria (ADV_Q15E)	95.7%	4.3%
The assessment tools or methods to be used (ADV_Q15F)	96.1%	3.9%
The proposed length of time to advertise (ADV_Q15G)	88.3%	11.7%
Choice of method used to staff their positions (ADV_Q15H)	95.3%	4.7%
Aligning managers' staffing needs with the priorities of their organization's HR Plan (ADV_Q15I)	59.4%	40.6%

Table 12: Percentage of **staffing advisors** who indicated that the input they provided to managers influenced managers' staffing actions in each of the following areas

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Testing accommodation for candidates (ADV_Q20B)	3.9%	15.3%	32.7%	48.0%
Employment equity considerations (ADV_Q20C)	2.6%	20.6%	43.7%	33.0%
Identifying the area of selection (ADV_Q20D)	0.3%	4.9%	35.2%	59.6%
Establishing the merit criteria (ADV_Q20E)	0.3%	4.3%	30.4%	65.0%
The assessment tools or methods to be used (ADV_Q20F)	0.2%	5.2%	35.1%	59.4%
The proposed length of time to advertise (ADV_Q20G)	1.4%	7.9%	37.5%	53.1%
Choice of method used to staff their positions (ADV_Q20H)	0.4%	4.1%	37.7%	57.8%
Aligning managers' staffing needs with the priorities of their organization's HR Plan (ADV_Q20I)	1.1%	12.1%	47.1%	39.7%

Table 13: Percentage of **managers** who indicated that the information provided to them by staffing advisors assigned to their appointment processes was **not useful**

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Yes*	No
Consideration of persons with priority entitlements (MAN_Q70_1)	24.2%	75.8%
Testing accommodations for candidates (MAN_Q70_2)	15.4%	84.6%
Employment equity considerations (MAN_Q70_3)	11.8%	88.2%
Identifying the area of selection (MAN_Q70_4)	25.9%	74.1%
Establishing the merit criteria (MAN_Q70_5)	50.2%	49.8%
The assessment tools or methods to be used (MAN_Q70_6)	54.6%	45.4%
The proposed length of time to advertise (MAN_Q70_7)	24.9%	75.1%
Choice of method used to staff their positions(MAN_Q70_8)	55.4%	44.6%
Alignment of their staffing needs with the priorities of their organization's HR Plan (MAN_Q70_9)	43.1%	56.9%

* Note: Negatively phrased question — only managers who indicated they disagreed that staffing advisors in their organization provided them with useful advice (MAN_Q65B) responded to this question.

Awareness and understanding of political activities and non-partisanship

Highlights – Political activities

While most employees report they understand their rights and obligations for engaging in political activities, they indicated that their departments and agencies need to keep them better informed.

- Nearly 98% of **employees** did not engage in political activities beyond voting or seeking candidacy
- A majority of **employees** (80.1%) reported a moderate or great awareness of their rights and obligations for engaging in political activities
- Less than two-thirds of **employees** (63.6%) indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, their department or agency keeps them informed of their right to engage in political activities
    - However, 88.5% of **employees** indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, they are able to make informed decisions about political engagement
- More than three-quarters of **managers** (76.6%) believed that, to a moderate or great extent, they could provide guidance and answers to their employees on engagement in political activities

Table 14: Results related to engagement in political activities

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Yes	No
Percentage of **employees** who indicated that they engaged in political activities — other than voting or seeking political candidacy — between January 1 and December 31, 2017 (ALL_Q25)	2.4%	97.6%

Table 15: Results related to awareness and understanding of political activities

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **employees** indicated that they are aware of their rights and obligations for engaging in political activities (ALL_Q15A)	3.4%	16.6%	44.5%	35.6%
Extent **employees** indicated that their organizations keep them informed of their right to engage in political activities (ALL_Q15C)	11.2%	25.2%	35.9%	27.7%
Extent **employees** indicated that they are able to make informed decisions about engaging in political activities (ALL_Q20D)	2.1%	9.3%	32.8%	55.7%
Extent **managers** indicated that they could provide guidance and answers to their employees regarding engagement in political activities (ALL_Q15E)	5.7%	17.7%	41.7%	34.9%

Highlights – Non-Partisanship

An overwhelming majority of employees believed they can carry out their duties in a politically impartial manner.

- Over 96% of **employees** indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, they are able to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties
- 7 out of 10 **employees** indicated that, to a moderate or great extent, their department or agency keeps them informed of their responsibility to be politically impartial

Table 16: Results related to awareness and understanding of non-partisanship

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **employees** indicated that they understand their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties as public servants (ALL_Q15B)	1.3%	6.3%	25.8%	66.5%
Extent **employees** indicated that their organizations kept them informed of their responsibilities to be politically impartial in carrying out their duties (ALL_Q15D)	8.0%	21.3%	36.7%	33.9%
Extent **employees** indicated that they understand the importance to be perceived as being politically impartial in carrying out their duties (ALL_Q20A)	1.0%	4.7%	19.3%	74.9%

2018 Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey Results	Not at all	To a minimal extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Extent **employees** indicated that they are able to carry out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (ALL_Q20B)	0.7%	2.9%	15.9%	80.5%
Extent **employees** indicated that, within their work units, employees carried out their duties as public servants in a politically impartial manner (ALL_Q20C)	1.1%	4.0%	21.8%	73.0%

Appendix A: Participating departments and agencies

Table 17: Participating departments and agencies, and final response rates

Department or agency	Final response rate
Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada	51.7%
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	44.3%
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	55.7%
Canada Border Services Agency	44.2%
Canada Economic Development for Québec Regions	51.7%
Canada School of Public Service	46.5%
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	56.4%
Canadian Grain Commission	66.0%
Canadian Heritage	48.7%
Canadian Human Rights Commission	50.5%
Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat	52.2%
Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency	54.8%
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	52.4%
Canadian Space Agency	49.6%
Canadian Transportation Agency	56.0%
Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP	54.7%
Copyright Board of Canada	70.6%
Correctional Service Canada	33.2%
Courts Administration Service	45.2%
Department of Finance Canada	47.2%
Department of Justice Canada	49.4%
Department of National Defence (public servants)	49.1%
Department of National Defence (non-civilian managers)	39.8%
Employment and Social Development Canada	52.2%
Environment and Climate Change Canada	48.2%
Farm Products Council of Canada	68.8%
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario	54.6%
Financial Consumer Agency of Canada	63.6%
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	36.5%
Global Affairs Canada	49.0%
Health Canada	47.6%
Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada	41.4%
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	50.5%
Indian Oil and Gas Canada	69.0%
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada[4]	43.5%

[4] Note: Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Department of Indigenous Services Canada were not identified in the sample file of October 2017, but were available for selection as the respondent's department in the survey questionnaire.

Department or agency	Final response rate
Infrastructure Canada	47.5%
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	52.5%
International Joint Commission	50.0%
Library and Archives Canada	62.6%
Military Grievances External Review Committee	66.7%
Military Police Complaints Commission of Canada	55.6%
National Energy Board	56.6%
Natural Resources Canada	45.6%
Office of the Chief Electoral Officer	52.2%
Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Canada	46.9%
Office of the Commissioner of Canada Elections	72.0%
Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada	75.0%
Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages	51.4%
Office of the Correctional Investigator	60.0%
Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada	25.6%
Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada	46.8%
Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada	65.2%
Office of the Secretary to the Governor General	44.8%
Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy of Canada	54.4%
Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada	45.0%
Parole Board of Canada	48.9%
Patented Medicine Prices Review Board	43.3%
Privy Council Office	35.1%
Public Health Agency of Canada	46.4%
Public Prosecution Service of Canada	53.5%
Public Safety Canada	48.1%
Public Service Commission of Canada	51.6%
Public Services and Procurement Canada	52.4%
RCMP External Review Committee	66.7%
Royal Canadian Mounted Police (public servants)	50.8%
Royal Canadian Mounted Police (non-civilian managers)	46.6%
Shared Services Canada	52.5%
Statistics Canada	60.9%
Status of Women Canada	38.7%
Supreme Court of Canada	38.8%
Transport Canada	51.7%
Transportation Safety Board of Canada	51.4%
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	49.1%
Veterans Affairs Canada	55.1%
Veterans Review and Appeal Board	52.7%

Department or agency	Final response rate
Western Economic Diversification Canada	58.1%
Staffing and Non-Partisanship Survey	**47.6%**